

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated February 18, 2010 within three months. Claims 38-70 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 38-69. As discussed below, the Examiner did not address claim 70 in the Office Action. Applicants cancel claim 70 without prejudice to filing claims having similar subject matter in this or other applications. Applicants present amendments to the claims and submit that the amendments find support in the specification, claims, and drawing figures as filed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejects claims 38-41, 44, 46-49, 52, 54, 56-58, 62, and 64-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)¹ as being unpatentable over Hyuga, U.S. Patent No. 5,818,733 (“Hyuga”) in view of Glatt, U.S. Patent No. 6,724,421 (“Glatt”) and Myers, U.S. Patent No. 5,751,289 (“Myers”). The Examiner rejects claims 38-41, 44, 46-47, 52, 54, 56-58, 62, and 64-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)² as being unpatentable over Hyuga, in view of Araki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,737,847 (“Araki”) and Myers. The Examiner rejects claims 42 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyuga, in view of Araki and Myers, and further in view of Anderson, U.S. Patent No. 5,684,476 (“Anderson”). The Examiner rejects claims 43, 45, 51, 53, 55, 59, 61, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyuga, in view of Araki and Myers, and further in view of Bro, U.S. Patent No. 5,722,418 (“Bro”). Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections, but present amendments to the claims to further clarify the patentable aspects of the claims and to expedite prosecution.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on April 5, 2010. In the interview, the Examiner acknowledged that he did not reject claim 70 in the Office Action. The Examiner agreed that claim 70 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, incorporating the elements of the corresponding independent claim. Applicants present amendments to independent claims 38, 47, 56, and 67 in accordance with the Examiner’s comments, and respectfully submit that these amendments differentiate the independent claims from the cited references. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 38, 47, 56, and 67.

Specifically, as noted previously, Hyuga discloses a group of cameras at a location (e.g.,

¹ Applicants believe the Examiner meant to reject these claims under § 103(a).

² These rejections appear to also be under § 103(a).

a golf course) where each of the cameras is capable of recording an image of an object (e.g., golfer) located in a particular section of the location (e.g., at the ninth hole green). One of the cameras is selected from a known, current location of the object being observed: “Based on the locational signals from receiver (21), camera controller component (26) selects camera (27i) ~ (27n), (27c) and controls panning and tilting of the selected camera” (Abstract). The location of the object is *known*, for example, by a signal from a “mobile unit which is in the possession of each [golf] player or caddie . . . [which] transmits signals revealing its *location*” (col. 4, lines 14-36). “Therefore, according to the invention, it is easy to *know the location* of the sender of the signals and take his picture with an imaging device” (col. 2, lines 7-9) (emphasis added). Once the system in Hyuga determines *an actual location* of the object to be monitored, a camera *in the actual location* is selected to record an image of the object.


Although Hyuga discloses a camera for taking a picture of a patient (see Abstract), this camera does not provide “visual data to a movement module, wherein the movement module is configured to determine a movement vector of a movement of the object *based at least in part on the visual data*,” as recited in claim 67 (emphasis added), and as similarly recited in claims 38, 47, and 56. The other cited references do not account for this deficiency. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 38, 47, 56, and 67.

Dependent claims 39-46, 48-55, 57-66, and 68-69 variously depend from independent claims 38, 47, 56, and 67. Therefore, Applicants assert that dependent claims 39-46, 48-55, 57-66, and 68-69 are differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons stated above for differentiating independent claims 38, 47, 56, and 67, as well as in view of their own respective features.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are distinguishable over the cited references. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject application. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/6/10



David G. Barker
Reg. No. 58,581

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6376
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: dbarker@swlaw.com